



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,083	06/06/2001	Dean C. Marchand	COS-99-012	6214

25537 7590 08/27/2002

WORLD COM, INC.  
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT  
1133 19TH STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

DEANE JR, WILLIAM J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2642

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/875,083

Applicant(s)

MARCHAND ET AL.

Examiner

William J Deane

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,495,521 (Rangachar)

Rangachar teaches a method for preventing special service fraud in a telephone network comprising maintaining at least one record, each record associated with a special service call number (Col. 4, lines 25 – 41) and adding an originating number to a record and blocking all to a terminating special service number when there is a match (note Col. 3, line 53, Summary of Invention and Col.5, lines 62 – 67).

With respect to claim 2, note CS1 in Fig. 1.

With respect to claim 3, note use of ANI, Col. 3, line 52 and Col. 4, line 52.

With respect to claim 4, note col. 4, line 41 and Col. 5, line 24.

With respect to claim 5, note Col. 5, lines 25 – 36 and Col. 6, line 64 – Col. 7, line 28.

With respect to claim 6, note that TSN could be a long distance carrier and ADS could be the local exchange.

With respect to claim 7, the STP could be the bridge switch.

With respect to claim 8, note that the system is an automatic switching and control system (note Figs.).

With respect to claims 10 – 11, note the above rejections and Col. 10, lines 54 – 65.

With respect to claim 14, note Fig. 2 and fraud intelligence unit and the alert report.

With respect to claim 15, such is inherent from the rejections above.

With respect to claim 16, note CS1.

With respect to claim 17, note Col. 4, line 41 and Col. 5, line 24.

With respect to claim 18, note Col. 3, lines 52 and 53 and Col. 4, line 44.

With respect to claims 19 - 20, the LEC could be ADS or the ACPO in Fig. 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangachar in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,957 (McConnell).

Rangachar teaches the claimed device except for the particulars of an AIN network. Note that Rangachar teaches a CCIS, as STPs are packet switches. This out of band signaling has been replaced with a newer out of band signaling called SS7. McConnell teaches the use of SS7 (note Fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2642


to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the Rangachar device and method with SS7 as taught by McConnell as such would only entail the replacing of one well known out of band signaling for another.

With respect to claim 12, note that McConnell teach the use of SMS, SCP in a SS7 signaling system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the Rangachar device and method with the system as taught by McConnell as such would only entail the substitution of one intelligent network with another. With respect to the SSCP such are also well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use an SSCP wherever it was deemed necessary.

With respect to claim 13, the use of ACDs are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use an SSCP wherever it was deemed necessary. In addition, note use of IVR in McConnell Col.1, line 36. An IVR is usually the front end of an ACD.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (703) 306-5838. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (703) 872-9314.

  
**WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

24Aug02